

-- REMARKS --

The above amendments to the claims are strictly for clarifications purposes, and were not made in response to the 102, and 103 rejections made by the Examiner, or the references cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Arnold et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,141,196), the Examiner's rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold et al.* in view of *Wisniewski* (U.S. Patent No. 6,382,580), the Examiner's rejection of claims 33 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold et al.* in view of *Wisniewski* and in further of *Sullivan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,314), the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Frank et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,177,665), in view of *Chang* (U.S. Patent No. 5,214,574), and the Examiner's rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Frank* in view of *Chang* and further in view of *Sullivan et al.* is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

The claims that are pending are claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-21, and 33-38. As in initial matter, the Applicants note that the Examiner has indicated that claims 34-37 are allowed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that each of the mounting pads includes a concave body portion. Claim 1 also has been amended to clarify that the plurality of mounting pads includes a first mounting pad positioned to contact and retain a bottom edge of the personal computing device and a second mounting pad positioned to contact a side edge of the personal computing device wherein the bottom edge is substantially perpendicular to the side edge. None of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, disclose these features. For example, the *Wisniewski* reference does not disclose a first mounting pad positioned to contact and retain a bottom edge of a personal computing device and a second mounting pad positioned to contact and retain a side edge of the personal computing device wherein the bottom edge is substantially perpendicular to the side edge. In other words, the *Wisniewski*

reference does not have mounding pads that contact only the bottom of a personal computing device and the sides of the personal computing device.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 2, 4-12, and 14-21, each depend from claim 1, and are thus also allowable.


Similarly, independent claims 33 and 38 each have been amended to clarify that the flexible mounting pads each include a concave body portion. Claims 33 and 38 have also been amended to clarify that the plurality of mounting pads includes a first mounting pad positioned to contact and retain a bottom edge of the personal computing device and a second mounting pad positioned to contact a side edge of the personal computing device wherein the bottom edge is substantially perpendicular to the side edge. As stated above, none of these prior art references, including the *Wisniewski* reference, disclose these features.

There is another reason why Claims 33 and 38 are allowable over the prior art of record. In particular, each of these claims (33 and 38) require flexible mounting pads. The Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the *Wisniewski* reference with the *Sullivan et al.* reference. The *Sullivan et al.* reference merely discloses synthetic rubber end caps that “keep the ends of the just-enumerated components from scratching or otherwise marring objects with which they come in contact and from scratching, cutting, or otherwise injuring the users of the computer support device.” Col. 3. lines 57-64. These end caps, which do not retain anything, have nothing whatsoever to do with flexible *mounting pads* that are used to retain a personal computing appliance. There is no suggestion in any of the references, including the *Wisniewski* and *Sullivan et al.* references, of making mounting pads out of a flexible material. The end caps disclosed in the *Sullivan et al.* reference certainly do not provide such a suggestion. Absent such a suggestion, claims 33 and 38 cannot be deemed obvious over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 33 and 38 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the case, the Applicants request that the Examiner please contact Applicants' attorney at (312) 673-0343.

Respectfully submitted,


MICHAEL D. GANNON
Registration No. 36,807
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: March 5, 2004

Baniak Pine & Gannon
150 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 1200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312 673 0360
312 673 0361 Facsimile